DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 613 HE 021 020

AUTHOR Nyquist, Jody D.
TITLE Preliminary Report on the International Teaching Assistant Training Pilot Project.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Instructional Development and Research.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 41p.; Paper identified by the Task Force on Establishing a National Clearinghouse of Materials Developed for Teaching Assistant (TA) Training.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communicative Competence (Languages); English (Second Language); *Foreign Students; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Language Skills; Skill Development; *Staff Development; Student Characteristics; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teaching Assistants
IDENTIFIERS *Teaching Assistant Training Project; *University of Washington

ABSTRACT

The initial phase of the University of Washington's International Teaching Assistant Training (ITA) Training Program is discussed. In addition to collecting demographic data for ITAs, English proficiency and student ratings of ITAs were assessed in order to design the training program. The pilot group was extremely diverse in background and performance. Length of time in the United States, English language fluency, teaching experience, educational background, as well as assigned teaching assistant roles and level of responsibility varied extensively. A training program (including a week-long workshop in September, quarter-long seminars during fall and winter quarters, tutorials, videotape critiques, and in-class observations) was designed to meet the specific instructional needs of this diverse group. Re-assessment of spoken English in March, along with student rating information, evidence substantial gains in fluency for most participants and indicated positive correlation between the level of spoken English and undergraduate student satisfaction. Progress in tutorials and in-class observations also indicated improved teaching performance form most individuals. The content and scheduling of training activities are specified. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL TEACHING ASSISTANT TRAINING PILOT PROJECT

May, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Center for Instructional

~~Development & Research~~

Univ of Washington

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Jody D. Nyquist

Director, Instructional Development
Center for Instructional Development & Research
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

The materials in the Special Collection on the Training of Teaching Assistants were developed through the active efforts of numerous educators who first met at the 1986 National Conference on the Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants held at the Ohio State University. Assisted by more than 80 individuals, the committee chairs listed below were able to establish the collection which will be developed and maintained by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education. This arrangement will enable faculty members, faculty developers, administrators, TA supervisors, and graduate teaching assistants to have access to TA training materials produced by institutions across the nation.

Task Force on Establishing a National Clearinghouse of Materials Developed for TA Training

Chair: Jody Nyquist, University of Washington

Subcommittees

ERIC Collection Committee-	Chair: Margaret Pryately University of Oklahoma
Council of Graduate Deans Clearinghouse -	Chair: Sheila Caskey Southeast Missouri State University
Exploration of a Review Process -	Chair: Lynda Morton University of Missouri

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education - Marilyn Shorr

Clearinghouse on ITA Materials - Janet Constantinides

International Teaching Assistant Training Project

A Special Project of the Center for Instructional Development and Research

Center for Instructional Development and Research

Jody D. Nyquist
Director for Instructional Development

Robert D. Abbott
Director for Program Research

107 Parrington Hall, DC-07
Seattle, WA 98195
(206) 543-6588
University of Washington

Graduate teaching assistants at the University of Washington play an important role in undergraduate instruction. They lead lab and quiz sections, tutor students individually, grade papers, and lecture. Approximately 170 of the 1,000 teaching assistants on campus perform all of these duties in a foreign language: English. In addition, the styles of teaching and learning used in their home countries may be quite different from those expected by their North American students. Views on the need *for*, as well as the needs *of*, international teaching assistants (ITAs) vary greatly, as is reflected in the perspectives offered by an ITA, an American undergraduate, and a department head.

> **Cheng Yeoh, International TA:** As a person with absolutely no teaching experience, I was pretty nervous before the quarter began. I needed some way to get acculturated to the role, functions, and life of a TA.
>
> **Duane Bland, US undergraduate:** I had an international TA who really knew the material inside and out. The communication was just not there, though, and as the quarter went on both he and all the students got more and more frustrated.
>
> **Mark McDermott, Chair, Physics Department:** International students are absolutely essential to our graduate program, and many of them can only be supported through teaching assistantships. It's reasonable to establish minimum competencies in English fluency as a prerequisite to instructional responsibilities, but avenues for training and preparing the ITAs to handle those responsibilities must also be available.

While English fluency is a critical requirement for effective communication in North American classrooms, awareness of cultural differences and their impact on classroom interaction is also essential. Thus, emphasis on English for specific purposes, instructional communication, and intercultural communication are incorporated into the goals, content, and learning activities of CIDR's ITA Training Project.

GOALS OF CIDR'S ITA PROJECT

To assist ITAs in learning:

1) Linguistic strategies and vocabulary specific to instructional contexts.

2) Various instructional strategies (such as lectures, discussions, and demonstrations) as they are used in American university classrooms.

3) Interpersonal communication skills that will allow individuals to understand and work with cultural differences between themselves and their undergraduates.

4) The views of faculty, administration, parents and undergraduates toward teaching and learning.

5) The historical roots of the American educational system and how they shape beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning.

The project is committed to meeting the instructional needs of both the individual ITA, and the departments in which they teach. To reach the goals above, the ITA project consists of four interdependent parts. Before fall quarter new international teaching assistants participate in a 35 hour week-long workshop. During the academic year, participants are exposed to a variety of workshops and seminars. The ITA project staff work with individual departments to select the workshops which will best meet that department's instructional needs. In addition to meeting in groups for the orientation week and seminars, participants receive two kinds of individualized attention. Throughout the academic year, consultation allows for focus on concentrated linguistic, presentation and interpersonal aspects of teaching, and practice and feedback in those areas as needed. In addition, those with classroom responsibilities are periodically observed and given feedback about their instructional skill development. Though the content of the consultation and observation/feedback sessions are individualized, all participants receive basic information through the workshop and seminar offerings.

WORKSHOP AND SEMINAR TOPICS ADDRESSED BY THE ITA PROJECT

Topics dealing with the use of various instructional skills:

- Managing the first day of class
- Preparing and delivering a lecture
- Planning and executing an instructional discussion
- Using the chalkboard and overhead projector as additional means of communication
- Motivating students
- Using questions to meet instructional goals
- Using grading to meet instructional goals

Topics dealing with communication in instruction:

- Listening effectively
- Understanding nonverbal dimensions of classroom communication
- Using interpersonal communication skills to manage conflict in the classroom and during office hours
- Understanding and dealing with barriers to intercultural communication

Topics dealing with teaching and learning in America:

- Becoming familiar with cultural perspectives on teaching and learning
- Exploring perspectives on teaching at the University of Washington
- Discussing perspectives of experienced ITAs on teaching American undergraduates
- Discussing undergraduate perspectives on having an ITA

METHODS EMPLOYED

In addition to the four-part program cover which a wide variety of topics including the full range of CIDR resources (such as midterm instructor evaluations, videotapes, and print materials), the ITA project employs a variety of methods in order to attain the goals of the program. To improve individual presentational skills in areas of language and instructional strategies, video and audio tapes are made and critiqued. To insure a better understanding of the people on this campus, a variety of panel presentations are offered. Small group discussions and case study analyses are employed to help individuals develop their understanding of the cultural differences which may exist between themselves and their undergraduates. Simulations are used to stimulate spontaneous decision making and speaking. The project is thus designed both to present information about teaching and to facilitate processing of that information. Beyond phrasing questions intelligibly, for example, ITAs practice asking questions which are appropriate and productive in the classroom. The ITA project addresses instructional skills, cultural differences in communication, and English language production as they influence classroom interaction.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

of

THE INTERNATIONAL TEACHING ASSISTANT TRAINING PILOT PROJECT

PRELIMINARY REPORT

In brief, the Center for Instructional Development staff collected demographic data for project participants, assessed ITA English proficiency and analyzed student ratings of ITAs where appropriate in order to design an ITA Training Program. In terms of individual background and performance, the pilot group was extremely diverse. Length of time in the U.S., English language fluency, teaching experience, educational background, as well as assigned teaching assistant roles and level of responsibility varied extensively.

A training program including a week-long workshop in September, quarter-long seminars during fall and winter quarters, tutorials, videotape critiques, and in-class observations was designed to meet the specific instructional needs of this diverse group.

Reassessment of spoken English in March, along with student rating information, evidenced substantial gains in fluency for most participants and indicated positive correlation between the level of spoken English and undergraduate student satisfaction. Progress in tutorials and in-class observations also indicated improved teaching performance for most individuals.

Based on the experience of the pilot project, and the evident impact on the performance of International Teaching Assistants who participated, it is recommended that the program be continued. Demonstration of a required minimum level of spoken English, grouping for instruction and practice in similar teaching assistant roles (i.e., lecturer, lab supervisor, quiz section leader, etc.), along with continued individual development through tutorials and in-class observations will enhance the effectiveness of next year's program.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL TEACHING ASSISTANT TRAINING PILOT PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington stands to benefit from the enrollment of foreign students, especially in graduate programs. These individuals are important links in the international exchange of knowledge. They come to the campus representing the intellectual achievement of their own countries and return home a repository of what is available in ours. Furthermore, their experience in American higher education significantly impacts a life-long attitude toward our nation. Many of them will become influential leaders in their homelands.

In addition to their role in the exchange of knowledge, foreign students who also become teaching assistants inevitably influence the international perspectives of undergraduates attending the University. Local students, who might otherwise have limited foreign contacts, encounter the expertise and personality of these individuals in the classroom. Potentially, this encounter can be an important aspect of the appropriate education for citizenship in an increasingly integrated global community.

In fact, it is this contact between ITAs and undergraduates in U.S. universities that has generated considerable interest over the last five years. Between an awareness of the benefits of having international students on campus and a commitment to excellence in undergraduate education lies the difficulty of ensuring that ITAs assigned to the classroom are able to perform their duties effectively. Bailey (1984) has identified the following five

conditions that have led to a similar concern on many campuses: 1) the significant role that TAs play in undergraduate instruction, 2) the increased demand for accountability in higher education in the 1970's due to increased consumerism on the part of the students, 3) the declining number of Americans in some graduate programs making foreign TAs relatively more numerous and visible, 4) the ethnocentric origins of some undergraduate responses, and 5) the recognition of the short and long term benefits of international exchange that come from having international graduate students.

In support of Bailey's fourth point, Pialorsi (1984) states that the differences between the educational role expectations of ITAs and their students' educational experiences is a key factor in the potential for misunderstanding. Furthermore, from the side of the ITA much of the apparent bewilderment can be attributed to the variety and elasticity of the American value systems. For individuals arriving from countries where culture may be more homogeneous, this may create as great a potential for communication breakdown as the more obvious linguistic differences. All of which points to the observation that more than poor English is fundamental to the "problem" of the ITAs and that more than language training needs to be considered in a program designed to provide some solution.

It was in light of these cultural, linguistic, and instructional concerns raised by the presence of ITAs in the classroom that the administration of the University of Washington gave the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR) the responsibility for developing a pilot program to address the issues of ITAs at the UW. Three individuals were hired with backgrounds in English as a Second Language (ESL), cross-cultural communication, and instructional communication. The following report outlines the background, effort, and results of what the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR) staff has learned up to this point. Specifically, this report: 1) provides a review of similar programs conducted on other campuses; 2) describes the process for selecting the ITA participants involved in the pilot project; 3) explains the development, implementation, and modification of the training model that was employed; 4) describes

the evaluation methods used; 5) gives an overall assessment of the project; and 6) lists recommendations for the future. The first task undertaken by the CIDR staff assigned to the ITA training pilot project was to review the types of programs that had already been implemented at other institutions.

REVIEW OF OTHER PROGRAMS

A relatively new and as yet small body of literature has been produced related to ITA training. A portion of this material formats and successes of various programs that have been implemented.

In the fall of 1982, a survey of some 40 major universities showed that 15 had been or were currently involved in some form of ITA training (Turitz 1984). Twelve programs were run as a seminar (two of which had been discontinued) and the remaining three consisted of shorter orientation programs. Although most of the programs were run by the ESL unit on campus, six programs involved the participation of teaching resource or communication units. Two programs were run solely by a teaching or instructional development unit. About half of the seminar types were run for credit whereas the rest of the programs were noncredit. Only three programs were mandatory for ITAs. Almost all of the programs included aspects of language, culture, and pedagogy.

Bailey and Hinofotis (1978) report a one-day workshop practicing the skills of spoken English and opportunity for video feedback. Another program open to all foreign students ran for a week prior to the beginning of school in the fall and included brief talks in the students' field, questions and answers on the talks, practice in listening to lectures, taking exams, communicating with peers and professors, and cultural adjustments in the academic and non-academic setting (Gaskill and Brinton, 1984). On another campus, the foreign teaching assistants were required to arrive one month early and spent 36 hours a week developing appropriate awareness and skills for the classroom (Shaw and Garate, 1984).

The longest program reported ran for a full semester and covered topics related both to classroom and graduate study skills. Besides language skills, attention was given to techniques for classroom interaction, philosophical basis for higher education curricula, sensitivity to others through role-playing, and understanding the various roles of members of the university community (Rice, 1984). A similar program is offered at another school that runs on the quarter system. There the course is offered fall or winter with an optional follow-up course for those who choose to continue (Mestenhauser et al, 1980).

Although the length of the programs vary from campus to campus, there is an apparent consensus that an effective training program for ITAs should address three areas:

1. developing more effective use of the English language appropriate to the setting of higher education in the United States;
2. developing awareness and corresponding skills as an effective communicator in the setting of the undergraduate classroom; and
3. developing instructional skills in strategic areas related to classroom, laboratory, or student conference responsibilities.

Accordingly, the pilot program at the University of Washington was designed with these objectives in mind. Borrowing ideas from other programs reported to be successful, including adaptations based on recommendations for improvement and the judgement of CIDR staff members, the program was developed, modified and assessed.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

At the same time that the project was being developed, departments at the University were approached by CIDR and offered training opportunities for their ITAs based on the relative number in their departments. Because this was a pilot program a maximum of 30 participants was allowed.

Reflective of a national trend, most ITAs at the University of Washington are located in the sciences. Of approximately 180 ITAs, the majority are studying Engineering, Chemistry, Physics, Computer Science and Mathematics. The individual departments were ultimately responsible for determining who participated and who did not. Apparently, most

ITAs were not given an option. This plan led to a population that varied along several dimensions: background, English proficiency, sex, teaching experience, and task responsibilities.

Initial acceptance into the ITA Training Pilot Project required that each participant be available for a one week intensive workshop during September and be able to commit the equivalent of 3 hours per week for one quarter. The actual allocation of that time was determined as the project progressed.

THE DESIGN

The CIDR staff members assigned to the ITA project worked during the summer preparing a five day workshop. A total of 20 ITAs who had been designated by their own departments participated in the 30-hour workshop during the week of September 17-21, 1984. The workshop was used to introduce the project and relevant concepts, to provide a rationale, to pre-assess the ITAs in terms of their spoken English, communicator style, and teaching effectiveness, and to cover information needed by the ITAs prior to the beginning of the school year. Appendix A provides a detailed schedule.

The ITAs took the Speaking Proficiency English Assessment Kit (SPEAK) test to determine their English speaking ability. They were videotaped twice; first they defined a term and then introduced the courses they expected to teach. Both sessions included responses to audience questions following the individual ITAs presentation. Each videotape was reviewed with the ITAs in terms of English use and instructional effectiveness. Instructional material included segments on self-assessment, lecturing, effective classroom strategies, and handling difficult teaching situations. Cultural training involved segments on ethnocentricity, norms for U.S. universities, denotative and connotative meanings of instructional language, and listening skills. Finally, the ITAs completed self-reports on measures of teaching effectiveness and communicator style, and also completed an evaluation of the workshop experience.

A total of 20 individuals from six departments participated. The group was even more diverse than expected in terms of teaching experience and English proficiency. Most of the ITAs had never taught before; some had been teachers or trainers in their home countries for years. Participants' expected duties for the fall ranged from grading, to leading quiz sections, to conducting laboratory sessions, to lecturing. Their scores on the 300 point scale for the SPEAK ranged from a low of 120 to the top score of 300. The programs for fall and winter quarters had to be designed to accommodate these varied backgrounds and levels of competency. At the end of the week-long workshop in September, the ITAs were divided into two groups. One group was assigned to attend the fall seminar while the remainder would attend the same seminar during winter quarter. Because of the differences in levels of English oral fluency, a tutorial approach was developed. Another individualized aspect of the programs were the in-class observations conducted for those ITAs who held classroom responsibilities. The following sections describe the rationale for the design and operation of all three facets of the ITA Training Pilot Project, including the ESL tutorial, the in-class observations, and the weekly seminars during fall and winter quarters.

Tutorials

Initially the CIDR staff had planned to conduct English language training as either part of the seminar or to schedule a separate time for English classes of different levels. After the experience of the workshop and the results of the SPEAK test, the staff decided it would be better to meet with each individual privately. This meant that the English language specialist would meet with each student for 30 minutes a week over both fall and winter quarters. There were several advantages to the two-quarter strategy. A 30 minute session made the scheduling of both the trainer and the participants' time easier. More important, the two-quarter meeting schedule allowed for more consistent contact over a

longer period of time for those who needed it. In this way, each ITA potentially had contact with at least one CIDR staff member for the duration of the project.

The tutorial session involved intensive dialogue between the tutor and the ITA centered on the responsibilites and experiences associated with teaching tasks. In the context of practicing the actual presentation of lesson material or the discussion of potential questions, the following language learning activities occurred:

1. identifying and correcting weaknesses in pronunciation;
2. identifying and correcting grammatical weaknesses and clarifying the grammatical principle in question; and
3. indicating syntactical errors that may cause students problems and suggesting appropriate alternatives.

In addition to these typical activities that deal primarily with the improvement of the use of language inside a given sentence, attempts were also made to improve the communicative competence of the ITA. Since Hymes (1972) work on the concept of communicative competence, ESL writers have been attempting to make appropriate applications of the term to various sets of English language learners (Canale, 1983). The identification of the range of purposes for using English has given rise to the discipline of English for Special Purposes (ESP). English for ITAs would fall within that category.

Shaw and Garate (1984) have suggested that the appropriate model for ITAs must address both the ideational level (i.e., the structure of the sentence and smaller units) and the communicative function level. Drawing from Wilkin's (1977) work in semantico-grammtical categories, Shaw and Garate suggest that an ITA must first be able to select and manipulate the grammatical structures of English in order to convey appropriate meanings of events, processes, states, and abstractions. Simply stated, these categories concern structures at the sentence level or below the area of traditional ESL study and testing. In addition, responsibility in the instructional setting means the ITA must be competent in communicative function as well. The distinction here is that a function may be generated over a stretch of discourse including several sentences. For example, consider the function

of "demonstrating" which is readily identifiable with the task of an ITA. The ability to effectively demonstrate a concept obviously requires more skill than just a string of unconnected grammatically correct sentences (Munby, 1978). Hence the need to require that an ITA training program develop both the ideational and functional competence related to instructional responsibilites becomes obvious.

It was for this reason that the ESL tutorials focused on actual presentation material related to ITA duties. Attention to the rudiments of pronunciation and grammar was constantly related to the overall goal of communication in the classroom. The in-class observations were designed as another perspective to aid the ITAs in developing a better awareness of the impact of their instructional communication.

Classroom Observations

The CIDR staff conducted in-class observations for ITAs with classroom responsibilities following the consultation procedure guidelines described by Melnik (1976). In addition, many of the individualized techniques for training described by Staton-Spicer and Nyquist (1979) were incorporated. The use of consultations to improve teaching is described by Berquist and Phillips (1977) as "perhaps the most powerful methodology yet conceived for the actual improvement of in-class teaching" (p. 78).

The teaching consultation process involves three stages. During the first phase the consultant gathers information about the instructor's current skill through interviews, questionnaires and videotapes of actual classroom interactions. During the second phase classroom observations and interviews allow the consultant and instructor to focus on skills and behaviors that need to be changed. During the final phase the consultant gathers summative information to reassess the instructor's teaching effectiveness related to the teaching behaviors targeted for change (Berquist and Phillips, 1977).

Erickson and Sheehan (1976) found that students of instructors involved in consultations were able to perceive positive gains in teaching skill. In a follow-up

investigation, those authors found that improvements in teaching skill were relatively long-lived.

In practice, the ITA Training Pilot Project adapted Melnik and Sheehan's model for consultations following recommendations of Borich (1977) for formative evaluation procedures. During the first stage staff associates gathered information about participants in several ways. An informal survey sent to all departments revealed some of the more common problems that undergraduates have with ITAs. More direclty during the summer workshop, participants discussed with each other and staff associates what they perceived to be their own strengths and weaknesses in teaching. During this week, each participant was videotaped doing a simulated teaching event and that tape was critiqued by both the participant and the staff associate revealing more specific skill behaviors manifested or needed by the ITA.

During the second phase, classroom observations were combined with consultations to allow the CIDR staff member and the ITA to focus on specific skills and behaviors. As the consultant, the CIDR staff member supplemented the ITAs' own concerns with attention to the interpersonal and public speaking skills described by Stewart and Sprague (1984), as well as research supported effective teaching skills (Mohan and Hull, 1976; Rosenshine and Furst, 1971). These target skills provided both the content of the Friday afternoon seminar sessions as well as the strategies for improvement which were agreed upon by the ITA and the CIDR staff member after the in-class observations.

Each ITA who participated during the fall was observed twice during the quarter. For each session, the observer would first meet with the ITA prior to class to discuss the ITA's goals for the class session. During class, the observer would take notes and later meet with the ITA to discuss general strategies and specific behaviors. Often these observation and discussion sessions were supplemented by the material being presented and discussed during the Friday afternoon seminar.

The Fall Seminar

In addition to the tutorials and in-class observations, each ITA was required to attend a weekly seminar either fall or winter quarter. The seminar which was scheduled on Friday afternoon, continued to cover relevant aspects of culture and instructional communication. Furthermore, the ITAs were provided additional opportunities to practice with the videotape and receive feedback. Discussion time was provided so that the ITAs could form and interdisciplinary exchange of ideas about teaching.

The seminar was designed to progress alongside the ITAs' experiences in other University contexts. Discussions early on served two functions: diagnosis of the ITAs' most immediate concerns, and the provision of an arena in which the ITAs could discuss concerns with peers. Early sessions included material on preparing for class, clarifying one's oral communication, and managing the range of TA responsibilities. Later, the seminar was used to treat particular aspects of teaching more extensively, such as leading discussions, handling questions, managing conflict situations, and interacting with students.

In addition, the Communicator Style Measure (Norton, 1978) was administered to the participants. This self-rated instrument defines communicator characteristics such as distant, approachable, nervous, memorable, etc. The results of this analysis were used as part of an ongoing discussion process to facilitate cultural insights. Research in the relationship between "communicator style" and teaching performance would seem to indicate that awareness of one's own style in contrast to that of an effective instructor helps to target areas for development. Finally, the ITAs were given two more opportunities to be videotaped while role-playing a teaching segment, and to receive instructional and linguistic feedback on their performances. Appendix B provides the schedule of topics for fall quarter.

SOME INTERIM ADJUSTMENTS

By the end of the fall quarter, Center for Instructional Development and Research staff members judged that the ITA project was having limited but significant success. Not only were the ITAs getting personal and professional assistance, but also the project had made strides toward understanding and managing "the ITA problem" at the University of Washington.

However, the fall quarter experience also led to several adjustments in the overall program presentation during winter quarter. Students who had scored better than 250 on the SPEAK were given the option to drop the ESL tutorials; in-class observations were increased from two to three for participants with classroom or lab responsibilities; and the Seminar presentation of cultural and instructional material was restructured.

Information on the use of the SPEAK test for qualifying ITAs in other Universities indicates a range of 200 to 250 as acceptable evidence of fluency for classroom responsibilities (Stansfield and Ballard, 1984). Participants in this program who had scored better than 250 on the SPEAK in September had a significantly better ability to communicate in spoken English than those scoring below that score. Thus, based on the reported standard at other schools and the first-hand evidence of the tutorials, these ITAs were allowed to drop the weekly tutorial sessions if they wished. This did not imply, however, that they drop the other aspects of the program. In fact, most stayed involved in the classroom observations, the seminar, or both.

During the fall quarter, participants with classroom responsibilites had been observed only twice. Although this provided a baseline, some targeted areas for improvement and a follow-up to determine progress, it was felt that the overall impact was too limited. Therefore, the observations were extended to three for each ITA with a class, quiz section, or lab. In this way the CIDR staff member was able to encourage development of identified instructional skills over a longer period of time, allowing for stages in development.

Although the tutorials and in-class observations proceeded more or less according to plan and required only minor changes, the Seminar encountered several unexpected difficulties. This led to some adjustments in order to more directly address the needs of the participants.

The structure of the fall quarter seminar approached culture with an open discussion format. For most students this was apparently an unfamiliar mode. Results of the discussion were often limited and it was not uncommon for one or two student perspectives to dominate. Therefore, in an attempt to avoid the limitations of the open-ended approach, culture was dealt with in a more direct and deliberate way in the winter quarter seminar. The concept of "intercultural communication competence" was addressed (Ruben 1976) and several conceptual categories were introduced to help ITAs make informed comparisons between their native cultures and life at the University of Washington. Participation in exercises and role plays served to illustrate and apply these concepts (Casse, 1981).

In addition to restructuring the approach to culture, the winter seminar addressed more specifically the range of TA responsibilities. The somewhat awkward divisions between graders, lab supervisors, and quiz section leaders led to more time during the winter allocated to preparation for a given class session. Other changes that improved the instructional portion of the seminar included individual rather than group review of video-tapes and comparative information between the ITAs' fall and winter teaching experiences (see Appendix C).

Finally, the attendance difficulties that had been encountered during the fall were anticipated and addressed early during winter quarter. Out of 11 ITAs scheduled to attend the fall seminar only 5 participated. Of the six who did not attend, two were changed to research assistantships and one had a scheduling problem. After futile efforts were made to solve apparent conflicts for the other three, they agreed to attend the winter seminar instead.

At the outset of winter quarter, several measures were taken to solve the attendance problems, with cooperation from all levels of university administration. Departments were asked to accommodate the seminar schedule and to help the ITAs participate through informal support. This apparently made the difference as 15 ITAs attended regularly, including two individuals who were new to the program, replacing those who had been transferred to RA positions.

Summary

Participation in the project consisted, therefore, of ITA attendance at a week long workshop, and a quarter long seminar that met once a week for two hours. Each ITA who had classroom or lab responsibilites was observed and critiqued. In addition to these activities, most individuals met with a language trainer once a week to develop his or her English proficiency. Although the winter quarter seminar addressed more specific aspects of culture, there was enough similarity with the fall quarter seminar to provide comparison between them.

RESULTS

Although the primary results of the ITA Training Pilot Project were qualitative and descriptive, a few quantitative measures were made that helped to identify the issues that need to be addressed to meet the goals of an effective ITA training program.

Quantitative Measures

The SPEAK test was used to assess an individual's comprehensibility in spoken English, the most often cited complaint of undergraduate students in ITA classrooms. This test was given on the second day of the workshop in September and again toward the end of winter quarter in March. Of the 18 individuals taking the test in September, 8 scored above 250, a widely accepted conservative estimate of adequate oral fluency for the classroom. In view of having met this standard, these 8 individuals were exempted from taking the test again in March.

The mean for the other 10 scores in September was 172, with a standard deviation of 34. Of the 10 ITAs who scored below 250 in September, 9 were retested in March. The mean for these ITAs was 234 with a standard deviation of 42. If the score for the only individual who did not improve is dropped, the mean rises to 245 and the standard deviation is reduced to 30. In terms of individual success only two of the original 20 failed to achieve the proposed 230 minimum for classroom instruction responsibility after two quarters in the program. These two individuals also had TOEFL scores below the 580 minimum required for ITAs with classroom responsibility.

The other quantitative measure administered consisted of student ratings of the ITAs instruction. Although ony 4 individuals have ratings for both quarters due to shifts in assignments and other variables, the overall ratings when weighted for the number of students in a given class showed some increase. For 14 classes, the fall quarter mean student rating for "quiz section/lab/lecture as a whole" was 2.93 with a standard deviation of 0.55. In the winter quarter ony 10 classes were rated, and the overall mean rose to 3.39 with an 0.56 standard deviation.

Aslo relevant is the correlation between the SPEAK scores and student ratings for ITAs in general. Based on a study done by the Educational Assessment Center (EAC) for the Graduate School the correlation between SPEAK score and student ratings was 0.47 for a sample of 34 ITAs. Furthermore, for ITAs achieving 230 or better on the SPEAK test, the mean student rating was 3.38 which translates to a percentile rank of about 40 when compared to the ratings for all TAs. ITAs scoring below 230 on the SPEAK had a corresponding mean student rating of 2.78 which translates to a percentile rank of about 10 when compared to all TAs rated. These results have led to consideration of establishing a minimum SPEAK score for classroom responsibilities in addition to the TOEFL requirement of 580.

Two instruments were administered to the ITAs to assess dimensions of communicator style and problem solving style. Since these instruments were developed on

English-speaking subjects their usefulness for ITAs was investigated in the pilot project. Consequently, the results were used for discussion purposes only in seminar. A forthcoming CIDR report examines the psychometric aspects of the results for these instruments.

Qualitative Measures

Two CIDR staff members and a third researcher, trained in qualitative methods, observed the workshop and the fall and winter seminars. All three reseachers took copious field notes to contribute to a general account of the project. Due to the complexity of the project, it is possible the qualitative data may be the most reliable information from which to draw inferences. Additionally, the researchers are conducting case studies to track in depth the progress of individual ITAs. Finally a videotaped log of the project is being recorded, and individual ITA presentations have been videotaped verbatim, providing both qualitative data and a source of potential quantitative, behavioral data. The results of these studies are not available at this time.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PILOT PROJECT

For many ITAs, the CIDR project was the first time so much conscious attention was focused on the self. Speaking publicly, being videotaped, performing role-plays, and being asked to evaluate one's instruction are just a few of the new experiences encountered by the ITAs.

In the end, twenty-nine ITAs participated in the project (Appendix D provides a profile). Six ITAs either shifted to RA positions or otherwise withdrew before completing the program. Attendance and participation of those who did not withdraw was varied.

The Participants

When a group of people is labeled "international," like the ITA group, heterogeneity is to be expected. The degree to which participants varied, however, and the dimensions along which they varied, was not fully realized nor appreciated until the fall seminar began.

Although it was clear that all the ITAs in the program were non-native English speakers, the degree to which participants varied in their English use was startling. Some participants had just arrived in the United States; others had complete high school and undergraduate work in the U.S. One person had worked in U.S. business for several years. Some had extensive teaching experience; some had never taught before. Experiences with English in the U.S. are equally varied. Some participants live with other people from their native country and avoid English except for classes.

Many participants said that they compartmentalize the parts of their lives that involve English. An ITA, for example, may listen to English lectures, read assigments by translating them to his or her native language, do the same for homework problems, but process in English those problems that are solved in the role of teaching assistant (TA). On the other hand, some of the ITAs said they are so accustomed to English that they have difficulty when they return home. For this group, all information is processed in English; roommates are likely to be from the U.S., and further fluency is picked up from television. This range made it difficult to find the "critical center" of the group; CIDR staff had difficulty deciding where to begin and how to address material in a way that was relevant to everyone. The line between "talking over their heads" and "being condescending" was blurred.

Another unanticipated variable was differentiated operating procedures among departments. The UW academic departments involved in the project each ran things a little differently. For example, some ITAs came to the U.S. knowing their responsibilities. Others did not know until after the second week of the quarter. Some departments scheduled ITA responsibilities to accommodate the project; others changed nothing. Perhaps a related variable was attendance at the seminars. Of the 19 ITAs scheduled to attend English tutorials, 14 attended regularly.

The most significant discovery in presenting the seminar was the range of responsibilites that needed to be addressed. Among the five who regularly attended the fall

sessions, responsibilites ranged from grading papers and holding office hours, to running a quiz section, to supervising a laboratory, to having complete responsibility for a large lecture class. Participants in the winter seminar varied similarly with one ITA working with a graduate course and another responsible for a walk-in lab that was open for several hours every day. Given the dimensions and range of diversity, with only three contact hours per week, for one quarter, it was a difficult challenge to present information that all participants would perceive as useful and important. It was for this reason that the program was designed to provide individualized attention in the ESL tutorials and in-class observation, and a group format in the Friday afternoon seminar to address more common issues and concerns.

The ESL Tutorials

By the end of the program, English language progress was varied. Pronunciation problems were addressed but available time limited the amount of progress achieved. Some semantico-grammatical problems came to light for each individual and instruction addressing these were incorporated. The greatest time and effort was spent working with the ITAs ability to do effectively the work they were hired to do (i.e., to communicate competently in the relevant domains of discourse). Classroom interaction and course material therefore received much attention. Probably the most successful repair was with ITAs who are mentally fluent in English (i.e., they do most of their academic thinking in English) but are unintelligible due to the speed with which they mispronounce the English language. Through the awareness achieved through use of videotaped presentation and the reenforcement of the tutorial sessions, several individuals were able to achieve a greater comprehensibility. Given the amount of time available after graduate studies and TA responsibilities, that actual repair of ingrained patterns of mispronunciation is questionable. However, attention to speed of speech and especially to achieving major English tonal patterns can raise the level of comprehensibility.

In addition to language training the ESL tutorial also became a forum for individual concerns that are culturally oriented. Participants asked for advice and reassurance, and often seemed bewildered in coping with their new environment. The trainer used these concerns to illustrate important concepts, to practice skills, and to try to help participants integrate new experiences with previous ones. For some, the tutorials provide the only opportunity to discuss personal concerns, and this is an added advantage of meeting individually with ITAs once a week over two quarters.

Classroom Observations

By paying attention to individual concerns and performance, the in-class observations also revealed some interesting patterns of development. In considering the results of the observations, however, it is important to keep in mind that their purpose was formative and not summative and therefore the following comments should be taken as general and descriptive.

In terms of teacher behavior, three issues were fairly consistent across all situations. For most ITAs, engaging students in productive discussions is a problem. Questions tended to be either too low level to encourage discussion or too abstract for students to understand. For several teachers, the speed of their speech combined with accent and mispronunciation led to student confusion and frustation. In these cases, students often relied on each other for interpretations. Finally all instructors were limited in their repertoire of teaching strategies.

The concerns that ITAs most frequently expressed relative to their teaching effectiveness tended to revolve around wanting to engage students in discussion and wanting to be sure students were able to understand them. They wanted to be sure that students were not obstructed by the language barrier and/or the organization and presentation of the material.

Although there was no effort to scientifically measure change, some small gains were observed by both the CIDR staff and the ITAs in several areas. Almost all of the

participants who said they wanted to work on organization and clarity of presentation exhibited some movement in that direciton. One relatively consistent behavior that these individuals incorporated into their teaching routine was the placing of goals for the lesson on the board and the discussion of these goals at the beginning of the class period. In addition, many of the participants made progress toward the consistent use of transitions and summaries in their lecturing. Interaction skills remained the biggest barrier for the teachers but even here some progress was seen. Several individuals were able to begin to replace rhetorical questions with the development of sequential question strategies. In two cases, a target skill was to repeat or to have the student repeat student questions and respond to these questions in a fashion that involved the entire class. Here again gains were realized.

The chalkboard was another general area of development. Initially, all ITAs tended to talk while facing the board, rather than turning to face the students after writing on the board. At other times, the board was not used enough. By the end of the program several ITAs had learned to use the board to write technical terms, key terms, and words that are difficult for the ITA to pronounce.

Although these difficulties may have some cultural origins, they are instructional problems and were therefore addressed by the program. Contrary to popular notions, classroom difficulties are not reducible to "bad English" and hostile interaction. Incomprehensibility is a potential concern in any classroom, but it was not a "hopeless problem" for most ITAs. Undergraduate students generally seemed to be trying to cooperate. Most important, the ITAs care. They are explicitly concerned about being understood and engaging students. This concern was further evident in the ITAs participation in both the week-long workshop in September and the Friday afternoon seminars during fall and winter quarters.

The Workshop and Seminars

Both the workshop and the seminars employed several methods of instruction. Didactic lectures were used when there were time limitations. Instructional discussion allowed participants to generate ideas inductively, and small group meetings freed the ITAs to disucss with peers things they may have been less willing to share with CIDR staff. Not only did discussions provide a forum for substantive learning, but also they helped participants develop conversational skills. Role plays, too, were used to illustrate concepts and to practice skills. Participants viewed a pre-recorded videotaped production on questioning strategies, and videotape was used to record ITAs role-playing teaching situations. These recordings were reviewed in class and in tutorial with the videotaped participant. The variety of instructional methods not only helped the CIDR staff do its job better, but also modeled appropriate, flexible instructional conduct for the participants. The instructional portions of the seminar went quite well with participants able to make the relevant application to the classroom. Obviously, the in-class observations provided the most important link and allowed the CIDR staff to tailor these portions of the program to the needs of the group.

The management of the cultural training was a bit more slippery. It is difficult to teach "culture," and during the fall especially, culture was most often addressed as a background frame for material on meaning, communication, and norms. In addition to workshop and seminar input on these topics, ESL and instructional tutorials elicited practical examples and explanaitons. Reports from other ITA projects indicated that an initial problem with ITAs involves getting them to acknowledge cultural problems as such. An indication that the project is working is the shift in explanations provided by the ITAs. Intially, many participants dismissed problems identified as "cultural," suggesting they were only "personal differences." When the CIDR staff discussed individual approaches to conflict, near the end of fall quarter, it was the ITAs who pointed out the cultural influences on individual approaches.

When the shift to more explicit cultural training was tried during the winter quarter, the larger group of participants was quite cooperative and they were able to discuss cultural issues readily. No measures were available, however, to assess the applicability of what was discussed. In general, participants responded to the sessions with interest but because of the urgency of their needs in the classroom, they tended to suggest that more time be spent on direct instructional materials. Most likely, the diverse orientation to cultural issues raised made it difficult to sense much progress in a group setting. In contrast to the type of group represented by the ITAs, most of the available material on cross-cultural training deals with the somewhat more homogeneous instance of Americans going overseas.

General Discussion

CIDR staff members judge that the ITA project has had limited but significant success. Not only are the ITAs, a previously somewhat neglected group of individuals, now getting personal and professional assistance, but also the project has made strides toward understanding and managing "the ITA problem" at the University of Washington.

By the end of the program, the ITAs who participated showed substantial improvement in their roles as University of Washington TAs. Much of this improvement can probably be attributed to the social support provided by the project. The precise effects of the project are difficult to interpret because of a wide range of external influences.

In spite of their many differences, there was one striking commonality throughout the group. Being among the top graduates in their own countries, these individuals possessed a personal quality and strength of character that was admirable. The difficulty of achieving effective communication in a foreign culture is far greater than any attempt to facilitate that achievement. The CIDR staff respects and appreciates the efforts these individuals have made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the ITA Training Pilot Project, the following recommendations are offered for the continuation of an ITA Training Program:

1. that a demonstration of language competency be required of all ITAs as evidenced by a test of spoken English (TSE, SPEAK, FSI, or other);

2. that ITAs be solicited from all departments and grouped according to similar TA tasks;

3. that a September workshop be offered for all interested ITAs focusing on cultural issues and initial concerns of ITAs about how to get classes started and general expectations for TAs;

4. that quarter-long seminars be offered that focus on the performance of particular TA tasks required of ITAs;

5. that priority be given to those ITAs working in classroom or lab settings according to available CIDR staff funded for this purpose;

6. that weekly tutorial assistance be provided for individuals attending the seminars, especially over the first quarter of an ITAs assignment;

7. that observations be conducted during the first two quarters of classroom or lab assignment by key members of the CIDR staff to facilitate the improvement of key instructional skills;

8. that cultural issues be addressed in general during the September workshop and on a case by case basis thereafter;

9. that departments make concessions for attendance at the quarter seminar equivalent to 3 hours per week; and

10. that student ratings be required of ITAs for all quarters taught unless two quarters above 3.5 are achieved.

It is hoped that the implementation of these recommendations based on the results of the ITA Training Pilot Project will result in an improvement in undergraduate education on this campus and the enrichment of the experience of international teaching assistants who study here.

REFERENCES

Bailey, K.M., 1984. The "Foreign TA Problem". In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Bailey, K.M. and F. B. Hinofotus, 1984. A One-day Workshop in Oral Communication Skills. In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Berquist, W.H. and S.R. Phillips, 1977. A Handbook for Faculty Development. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Vol.2.

Borich, G.D., 1977. The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process. Addison-Wesly Publishing Co.: Menlo, CA.

Canale, M., 1983. From Cummunicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In Language and Communication, Jack Richards and Richard Smith (Eds.). Longman: London.

Casse, P., 1981. Training for the Cross-Cultural Mind. Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research: Washington, D.C.

Errickson, G.R. and P. Sheehan, 1976. An Evaluation of a Teaching Improvement Process for University Faculty. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association: San Francisco, CA.

Gaskill, W. and D. Briton, 1984. A One-week Language Skills Orientation Program for Foreign Teaching Assistants and Graduate Students. In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Hymes, Dell, 1972. Introduction. In Functions of Language in the Classroom, C.B. Casden, V. John, and D. Hymes (Eds.), New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Melnik, M.A. and D.S. Sheehan, 1976. Clinical Supervision Elements: The Clinic to Improve University Teaching. Journal of Research and Development in Education.

Mestenhauser, J., W. Perry, R. Paige, M. Landa, S. Brutsch, D. Dege, K. Doyle, S. Gillette, G. Hughes, R. Judy, Z. Keye, K. Murphy, J. Smith K. Vandersluis, and J. Wendt. Report of a Special Course for Foreign Student Teaching Assistants to Improve their Classroom Effectiveness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.

Mohan, M. and R.E. Hull, 1976. Specifying Behavioral Components of Some Higher-Order Concepts of Teaching. Peabody Journal of Education.

Munby, J., 1978. Communicative Syllabus Design. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norton, R. "Foundation of a Communicator Style Construct." Human Communication Research, 1978, 4 99-112.

Pialorsi, F., 1984. Toward an Anthropology of the Classroom: An Essay on Foreign Teaching Assistants and U.S. Students. In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Rice, D.S., 1984. A One-Semester Program for Orienting the New Foreign Teaching Assistant. In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Rosenshine, B. and N. Furst, 1971. Current and Future Research on Teacher Performance Critieria. In B.O. Smith (Ed.) Research on Teaching Education: A Symposium. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ruben, B., 1976. Assessing Communication Competence for Intercultural Adaptation. Group and Organizational Studies.

Shaw, P.A. and E.M. Garate, 1984. Linguistic Competence, Communicative Needs, and University Pedagogy: Toward a Framework for TA Training. In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Staton-Spicer, A.Q. and J.L. Nyquist, 1979. Improving Teaching Effectiveness of Graduate Teaching Assistants. Communication Education.

Stewart, J.S. and J. Sprague, 1984. The Speaker's Handbook. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanich.

Turitz, N.J., 1984. A Survey of Programs for Foreign Teaching Assistants in American Universities. In Bailey, K.M., Pialorsi, F., and Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1984.

Wilkins, D.A., 1977. Notational Syllabi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

ITA INTENSIVE WEEK

Monday

Morning	Parrington Hall, Room 203
8:30	Formal introductions
9:00	Informal class introductions
9:30	Break
9:45	Program rationale Ethnocentricity ESL for the instructor Job training for teachers
11:30-12:30	Lunch
Afternoon	Parrington Hall, Room 203
12:30	PRCA Concerns data
1:15	Break
1:30	Share concerns data
2:30	Familiarization with videotaping Fun stuff, Etc. Assign "Defining a Term" for Tuesday assessment Assign groups for SPEAK assessment

Tuesday

Morning	Denny Hall, Language Learning Lab
8:30	Group I takes SPEAK assessment in Language Learning Lab Group II meets with instructors in Parrington Hall, Room 203
9:15	Group II takes SPEAK assessment in Language Learning Lab Group I meets with instructors in Parrington Hall, Room 203
10:00	Break
10:15	Explain assessment instrument and method of running it
11:30-12:30	Lunch
Afternoon	Raitt Hall, Video Rooms 105, 107, and 109
12:30	Three groups work through assessment Give 3 minute talks; Respond to 2 minutes of questions; and Join audience after presentation
2:00	Break
2:15	"Edit" of videotaped lectures Instructors review experience, describe, draw inferences from and transfer learning of videotaped lectures
2:45	Basics of communication theory

Wednesday

Morning	Parrington Hall, Room 203
8:30	Discuss and debrief Tuesday
9:00	Listening skills
10:15	Break
10:30	Effective teaching strategies Assign "Explaining My Responsibilities"
11:30-12:30	Lunch
Afternoon	**Parrington Hall, Room 203**
12:30	Preparation for CIDR "Distinguished Teachers" presentation
1:30	Attend CIDR "Distinguished Teachers" presentation

Thursday

Morning	Raitt Hall Video Rooms 105, 107, and 109
8:30	Debrief on "Distinguished Teachers" presentation
9:00	Three group rotation 1. ESL Feedback on "Defining a Term" 2. Videotaping "Explaining My Responsibilities" 3. "Edit" of "Explaining My Responsibilities" (NOTE: Break will be during "Edit" session for each group)
12:45-1:45	Lunch
Afternoon	**Odegaard Undergraduate Library, Video Booths** **Raitt Hall Video Rooms 105, 107, 109, and 121**
1:45	Review of videotapes for self assessment Instructional methods Communication style
2:30	Break (Return to Parrington Hall, Room 203)
3:00	Debrief/Discuss instructional assessment and communicator style assessment experience

Friday

Morning	Parrington Hall, Room 201, 203 and 204
8:30	Three group rotation ESL feedback on "Describing a Process" Norms in the classroom Strategies for teaching (NOTE: Break will be during "Norms" session for each group)
11:30-12:30	Lunch

Afternoon	Parrington Hall, Room 203
12:30	"Encounters with Teaching"
2:15	Break
2:30	Evaluation instrument for Intensive Week
3:00	Closure discussion
	Assign groups for fall and winter quarter sessions

APPENDIX B

Seminar: Teaching and Communication for International Teaching Assistants

Instructors:	Ann Darling	Parrington 102	543-0699
	Frank Underhill	Parrington 102	543-6588

Throughout the quarter we will meet each Friday afternoon from 1:30-3:30. The purpose of these meetings is to provide you with information about teaching and communication as well as assistance relevant to your specific situation. The topics to be covered will vary from week to week but each session we plan to set aside time for discussion about your unique concerns.

This course is designed as it is to help you further develop your ability to provide effective instruction to your undergraduate students. We will continue to provide assistance in the following targeted areas:

- developing skills for effective communication in undergraduate classrooms at the University of Washington
- developing instructional skills in strategic areas related to classroom, laboratory, or student conference responsibilities
- developing more effective use of the English language for use in the setting of higher education in the United States

Seminar Schedule

Date	Topic(s)
Jan.11	Orientation
Jan. 18	Giving Instructions and Responding to Student Work
Jan. 25	The Phenomenon of Culture (workshop and exercises)
*Feb. 2	Videotape Presentation #3: Giving Instructions
Feb. 8	Using Questions to Promote Understanding and Encourage Discussion
Feb. 15	Paradigms for Survival (workshop and exercises)
Feb. 22	Presenting Research Papers
Mar. 1	Training/Educating in Other Cultures (workshop and exercises)
*Mar. 8	Videotape #4: Presenting a Short Lecture
Mar. 15	Closure, Evaluations, and Recommendations

Seminar: Teaching and Communication for International Teaching Assistants

Instructors:	Ann Darling	Milt Thomas	Frank Underhill
Office Hours:	MW 3:30-5:00	TTh 2:30-3:30	TTh 9:00-11:00

Office: Parring 329
Phone: 543-0699

Throughout the quarter we will meet each Friday afternoon from 1:30-3:30. The purpose of these meetings is to provide you with information about teaching and communication as well as assistance relevant to your specific situation. The topics to be covered will vary from week to week but each session we plan to set aside time for discussion about your concerns.

This course is designed as it is to help you further develop your ability to provide effective instruction to your undergraduate students. We will continue to provide assistance in the following targeted areas:

- developing skills for effective communication in undergraduate classrooms at the University of Washington;
- developing instructional skills in strategic areas related to classroom, laboratory, or student conference responsibilities; and
- developing more effective use of the English language for use in the setting of higher education in the United States.

Seminar Schedule

Date	Topic(s)
Oct. 5	Giving Instructions and Speaking Spontaneously
Oct. 12	Language Behavior
Oct. 19	Videotape Presentation #3: Explaining a Process or Diagram
Oct. 26	Using Questions to Engage Students in Learning
Nov. 2	Conflict
Nov. 9	Videotape Presentation #4: Short Lecture
Nov. 16	Consulting with Individual Students
Nov. 23	HOLIDAY
Nov. 30	Communicator Style
Dec. 7	Evaluation and Final Comments

International Teaching Assistant Project

A year-long pilot project during 1984-85 provided training to 25 international teaching assistants (ITAs) in the areas of classroom cultural norms, instructional strategies pertinent to tertiary education, and English fluency. A week of pre-teaching intensive instruction took place in September, followed by two-hour weekly seminar sessions lasting for one hour. In addition to the seminar, classroom observations were conducted to facilitate concentration on individual TA needs. Further, weekly tutorial sessions with each participant enabled intensive practice areas of English fluency.

In 1985-86, the program will continue with a total of 40 participants. The intensive workshop took place during the week of September 16-20, and was attended by 25 participants. Within the 35 hours of instruction were included strategies for checking and improving students' understanding of material when teaching in a second language, both videotaped and audiotaped practice lectures with individual feedback, lectures and discussions dealing with how to organize a lecture, how to monitor and improve English comprehension and pronunciation, how to identify cultural differences in classroom attitudes and expectations, and how to manage conflicts resulting from such differences.

After the workshop, the participants were divided into two groups, depending on whether they had been assigned instructional responsibilities for the Autumn quarter. The group which has such responsibilities will attend a two-hour weekly seminar and receive three classroom observation/feedback sessions during the quarter. Lecture/discussion topics will include structuring questions in ways which encourage student participation, resources available for evaluating teaching, and self-monitoring and practice techniques for improving spoken English. Heavy emphasis will be placed on participants' practicing relevant skills, such as lecturing, giving instructions, working problems in ways which enable students to acquire skills necessary to do so themselves, and delivering a research paper in a conference-style presentation. Further, each seminar session will include discussion and practice of English structures and phrases relevant both to the topic and to the participants' discipline.

The group which has no instructional responsibilities will receive weekly tutoring sessions designed to improve their spoken English and prepare them in other ways to assume such responsibilities (e.g., practicing explanation of concepts relevant to their discipline, use of other teachers in their field as models for instructional strategies, expanding vocabulary and ability to provide alternative explanations and examples in response to student confusion).

The 40 ITA's scheduled by their departments to participate in the project have contact with approximately 800 undergraduates per week in some aspect of instruction. Some of them lead quiz, lab, or discussion sections, and 40% are graders and/or hold office hours to tutor individual students.

Research efforts related to the ITA project include a study of the effects of teaching experience and participation in an instructional/intercultural communication skills program on sensitivity to cultural differences, a comparison of the communicator styles between American and International TAs, and an examination of the effects of English fluency on teaching effectiveness.

The project staff consists of the Director for Instructional Development, three Staff Associates with expertise in ESL, intercultural communication, and instructional communication. Materials produced by the staff to this point include a cultural sensitivity

measure, a standardized classroom observation form oriented specifically to ITAs in U.S. undergraduate classrooms, and resource material relevant to ITA needs in areas of lecturing and use of questions, observation and information-gathering techniques to facilitate understanding of cultural differences, use of instructional media to improve comprehension of instructors teaching in a second language, and methods and materials for improving pronunciation in the context of a particular academic discipline.

A mid-project report and a final report were produced during the pilot project, and the latter was mailed to all departments. A campus-wide survey of all ITAs was conducted during the spring and summer of 1985. Observations of classroom teaching were conducted in several departments which have significant populations of ITAs during the summer. Assessments of the pilot project included participant satisfaction measures and partial data from student evaluations in last year's ITAs' classes. Information drawn from all of the above sources was used to design the program for this year, to formulate research projects, and to construct a grant proposal for development of interactive videodisc programs relevant to ITA instruction.

APPENDIX C

ITA PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTION - PILOT TRAINING PROJECT, 1984-85

Department	Teaching Task		Student Rating		SPEAK Score		ITA Seminar Attended	TOEFL Score	Years in Teaching (T); English Speaking Countries (E)	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Sept.	March			"T"	"E"
Elec. Eng.	NA	Quiz	NA	3.4	NA	NA	Winter	NA	0	3
Elec. Eng.	NA	Grader	NA	AN	NA	260	Winter	NA	1	1
Elec. Eng.	Grader	(RA)	NA	NA	211	290	Fall	607	0	0
Elec. Eng.	Grader	Quiz	NA	3.18	270	Exempt	Winter	NA	0	2
Elec. Eng.	Quiz	Quiz	NA	NA	NA	AN	Winter	NA	1	2
Elec. Eng.	Quiz	Lab	3.39	4.21	300	Exempt	Winter	660	0	0 (?)
Elec. Eng.	Lab	Lab	4.43	5.00 (?)	272	Exempt	Winter	NA	0	3
Elec. Eng.	Quiz	Grader	2.36	NA	262	Exempt	Fall	NA	0	3
Elec. Eng.	Grader	Quiz	NA	4.03	272	Exempt	Fall	NA	0	4
Elec. Eng.	Grader	Grader	NA	NA	NA	180	Winter	NA	3	0.5
Mech. Eng.	Grader	Lab	NA	NA	120	280	Winter	NA	3	0
Mech. Eng.	(RA)	(RA)	NA	NA	254	Exempt	None	NA	NA	NA
Mech. Eng.	Quiz	Quiz	3.32	NA	NA	NA	Fall	673	0	1 (HS)
Mech. Eng.	Lab	Lab	3.20	3.33	205	230	Winter	NA	1	2
Civil Eng.	Lab	Lab	3.75	NA	156	240	Winter	567	1	2
Civil Eng.	Lab	Lab	4.00 (?)	NA	209	230	Winter	570	0	2
Civil Eng.	Quiz	Quiz	2.69	NA	138	190	Winter	547	0	0
Mat. Eng.	Quiz	Quiz	NA	NA	NA	Garbled!	Winter	NA	0	2
Chemistry	NA	Lab	NA	2.50	187	230	NA	NA	0	0
Chemistry	Quiz	Quiz	2.34	2.95	211	270	Winter	530	0	0
Physics	Grader	Grader	NA	NA	156	150	Winter	567	3	0
Physics	Lab	Grader	2.55	NA	NA	180	Fall	577	0	0
Business	Lecture	Quiz	2.65	NA	261	Exempt	NA	656	7	5
Business	Lecture	NA	3.77	NA	286	Exempt	NA	663	0	7
Business	Lecture	Quiz	2.35	NA	134	NA	NA	597	0	2

Four individuals attended only one session before withdrawing:
Elec. Eng., Mech. Eng., Mat. Eng., Chemistry